This event outlined an ISD proposal for a “phased approach” to achieve deep emission reductions by 2050. John Drexhage, ISID, said the phased approach involves three country groups: developed countries, including all countries that currently have targets, all OECD members and Member States of the EU; “advanced” developing countries, based on yet-to-be determined criteria, but that might include Brazil, China, South Africa and others; and “other” developing countries. He explained that during phase I (2012-2017): developed countries would take on binding commitments based on a long-term goal to 2050; and collective or national goals for 2017 and subsequently at 10-year intervals beginning in 2020. He said “advanced” developing countries would set sectoral or sub-national no-lose targets with a base year of 2005.

Provided that developed countries meet their collective 2017 goal, Drexhage elaborated that phase II would begin in 2020 with “advanced” developing countries taking on binding commitments based on a long-term goal to 2050 and collective or national decadal goals beginning in 2020. He said “other” developing countries would be encouraged to develop NAMAs and explore the appropriateness of no-lose targets throughout the phases.

Dennis Tirpak, ISID, described design criteria for a new financial agreement under a post-2012 regime. He described different financing architectures to link available funds to developing country needs, noting the critical need to better address funding for “data, analyses, plans and actions.”

Representatives from five delegations responded to the proposal. Brazil said a financial mechanism that links NAMAs to funds could achieve significant emission reductions without imposing binding commitments. The Republic of Korea said a phased approach, such as moving from sectoral to nation-wide emission reductions, is interesting but that the proposed country categorization does not reflect the current negotiation dynamics.

Mexico stated that climate change cannot be addressed without the enhanced participation of developing countries and stressed that there is a need to involve all parties without establishing new categories. Canada agreed that the current categorization of countries is adequate for negotiations and stressed that a new regime must enable developing countries to undertake actions, noting that there will be differences among countries. China discussed historical responsibility, noted that developing countries are undertaking positive actions and stressed that their right to development must be ensured.

More information: http://www.iisd.org
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Global Policy Coherence 2009: Governance- Climate, Finance, Trade
Presented by the Institute for Environmental Security (IES)

This panel discussed policy recommendations to ensure coherence between climate change, trade and financial regimes.

Stressing the need for pragmatic solutions, Tom Spencer, IES, highlighted a lack of sufficient coherence on policy issues related to trade, finance and climate change. He said incoherence costs lives and is damaging to international negotiations, adding that policy goals could be achieved more easily if we had coherent governments.

Harris Gleckman, IES, discussed the complexities of cooperation among government ministries on climate change and its relationship to economic arenas. He underscored that a successful climate solution will necessarily require changes to financial and trade practices.

Melinda Kimble, UN Foundation, said World Trade Organization’s (WTO) negotiations have taken on a “new urgency,” and this is directly linked to the fact that trade is one of the tools we have to re-stimulate and inflate the global economic system. She explained that while the climate negotiations are also urgent, governments spend relatively few resources on it. She said the coherence discussion is very important but given the current focus on the trade agenda and the slow progress in Bonn, it will be very hard to synchronize these processes at this time.

Participants discussed, inter alia: challenges with mainstreaming climate change policies; conflict between intellectual property rights and the needs of developing countries for technology transfer; impacts of the WTO’s Doha round of negotiations on the global climate change negotiations; examples of coordination between ministries at the domestic level in Germany, Sweden, Costa Rica, China and the UK; greening of export credit agencies; and the possible correlation between inter-ministerial tensions and non-federal state structures.

The Role of the Ocean in Climate Change and Impacts to Coastal Populations: The Manado Ocean Declaration
Presented by Indonesia

This event highlighted key outcomes of the World Ocean Conference (WOC) and Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) Summit, held in Manado, Indonesia, 11-15 May 2009.

Indroyono Soesilo, Indonesia, stressed the importance of mainstreaming oceans into the final outcome of the 2009 Copenhagen climate change talks. He outlined the WOC Declaration, which was signed by 76 countries and 11 international organizations and includes provisions to: invite Parties to submit adaptation project proposals for coastal and ocean management to the Adaptation Fund Board; and encourage the UN Secretary-General to reflect ocean and climate change issues within the UN system.

Eddy Pratomo, Indonesian Ambassador to Germany, said the Declaration also calls for promoting affordable, environmentally sound and renewable ocean technologies and know-how, particularly for developing countries. He described a roadmap to mainstream ocean-sensitive policies into bilateral, regional and multilateral fora, including the UNFCCC and UN system.

Edward Allison, WorldFish Center, Malaysia, underscored that 520 million people depend on fisheries for their livelihoods. He outlined adaptation opportunities for coastal populations. Allison stressed the enormous
climate change mitigation potential of oceans and noted with concern the potential disruption of natural carbon sequestration systems due to ocean acidification.

Joseph Aitaro, Palau, outlined the Micronesia Challenge, in which five Micronesian states and territories agreed to effectively conserve 30% of near-shore marine resources and 20% of forest resources across Micronesia by 2020. Stressing that population relocation is not an option, he said the Challenge also addresses how to provide adaptation responses to the most vulnerable people, communities, islands and ecosystems.

Participants discussed, inter alia: the need to improve ocean science and data availability; and the potential for Indonesia, Palau and partners to recommend a submission on oceans for inclusion in a shared vision for long-term cooperative action under the UNFCCC.

International Regions Lay the Foundation for Implementation of a Global Deal
Presented by the Network of Regional Governments for Sustainable Development (nrg4SD)

This event discussed climate policy actions at the regional level. Luc Bas, Climate Group, UK, stressed the importance of securing UNFCCC recognition of sub-national actions.

Michelle Fournier, Quebec, Canada, said Quebec: reduced its emissions by 5% between 2003 and 2006; has a plan to reduce 1990-level emissions by 6% by 2012; joined 11 states and provinces to develop a cap-and-trade system; and seeks to expand markets for alternative technologies.

Linda Adams, California, US, joined the panel by video, stating that regional governments can be flexible in policy development. She listed California’s climate efforts, including, inter alia, policies on cleaner cars, alternative fuels and energy efficiency.

Christian Gyonvarch, Brittany, France, discussed examples of climate change impacts and regional policies in North Sumatra, Alaska, Tuscany, Sao Paolo, the Basque region and Brittany. He emphasized that regions will be partly responsible for implementation of climate policies that are negotiated internationally.

Oswaldo Lucon, Sao Paolo, Brazil, said: regional policies often depend on decisions reached at the global level; setting regional emission targets is worth consideration; and the baseline for emission reductions is of critical importance.

Rainer van Loon, North-Rhine Westphalia, Germany, described his region’s policies on energy efficiency, biomass, alternative energy sources, co-generation plants, and carbon capture and storage.

Yannick Glemarec, UNDP, said UNDP’s approach emphasizes work with regions, noting that 50-80% of GHG reductions would depend on actions by sub-national governments. He added that UNDP recommends highly participatory approaches to policy making and long-term policy impact assessments.

Christoph Nutall, UNDP, stressed the need for sharing expertise and know-how among regional governments and outlined exchange of experiences in Senegal, Catalonia, Uganda, Albania, Uruguay, Nigeria and Egypt, among others.
This event addressed the role of the transportation sector in tackling climate change.

Daniel Bongardt, German Technical Cooperation (GTZ), stressed the importance of the transport sector, noting it accounts for 13% of GHG emissions. He emphasized the need to integrate transport policy in climate change negotiations and facilitate capacity building, finance and transport-related NAMAs.

Cornie Huizenga, Asian Development Bank, said an international climate agreement cannot be effective without robust transportation sector provisions, and stressed the co-benefits of sustainable transport policies. He noted, inter alia, the importance of reducing travel, increasing energy efficiency, using different forms of transport, and integrating global, regional and national policies.

Holger Dalkmann, TRF, discussed recommendations to the Ad Hoc Working Groups regarding financing sustainable transport in a post-2012 agreement. He said countries could consider: creating a special transport fund; devising transport NAMAs that are MRVed under common UNFCCC rules; and commissioning studies on transport-related MRV actions. He also recommended considering a broad variety of co-benefits, developing criteria and indicators for sustainable transport and giving guidance on registration of transport NAMAs.

Armin Wagner, GTZ, spoke on capacity building and discussed the need to improve infrastructure planning, encourage use of public transportation and consider alternative fuels. He underscored the importance of targeted training, networking and building on global experiences.

Margrethe Sagevik, International Union of Railways, then introduced a panel of discussants who offered comments on the presentations.

Describing transportation as a “hidden” issue that is often overlooked in climate negotiations, Rae Kwon Chung, the Republic of Korea, said it will be the most promising and problematic sector in upcoming negotiations. Noting rapidly growing transport emissions, increasing car ownership and significant congestion problems, he said developing countries have the opportunity to avoid the mistakes made by others. He suggested that the EU include transport in their proposal for sectoral crediting mechanisms.

Moekti Handajani Soejachmoen, Pelangi, Indonesia, discussed the role of the private and public sectors and said reliance on public transportation is not a sufficient solution to transportation problems because of poor road quality. She stressed the importance of studying MRV and NAMAs in the transport sector, and including transport in climate negotiations.

Mark Major, EC, noted the complexity of MRV in the transport sector. He said public finance will be needed because carbon markets will not provide funding in the short term. Major stressed that EU governments are expected to receive substantial sums from Assigned Amount Units and expressed the opinion that there is no political appetite for creating a new fund for transport.

During the discussion, presenters and panelists said, inter alia: the transport sector needs prioritization at sub-national and local levels; the CDM was not designed for transport and sectoral crediting mechanisms could create incentives for new policies; transport emissions are difficult to measure; fuel subsidies need to be reduced; and existing investments in transportation need to be directed to climate-friendly policies.

More information:
http://www.sutp.org/bridging_the_gap
http://www.gtz.de
http://www.adb.org
http://www.trl.co.uk
http://www.pelangi.or.id
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